

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 14 and 25 are amended and claim 26 is added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Hoang in the September 20, 2007 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8, 10-14 and 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0014488 to Dalal et al. (Dalal); rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dalal; and rejects claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dalal in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0178833 to Kisiakov. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "an authenticator to control user access to the files in the shared workspace based on an access control list" and "the files are located in the shared workspace." Independent claims 14 and 25 recite, *inter alia*, "authenticating user access of the files in the opened workspace based on an access control list" and "the files are located in the opened workspace." Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, Fig. 3 and page 30, lines 11-15 and page 20, lines 14-17.

As discussed during the September 20, 2007 interview, the passage of Dalal relied on by the Office Action for disclosing the sharing and editing of files merely concerns real-time communications (RTC) and fails to concern actual files. The passage of Dalal relied on by the Office Action for disclosing an authentication unit fails to concern the authentication of user access to files in the shared workspace based on an access control list. Dalal fails to teach or suggest an authenticator to control user access to the files in the shared workspace

based on access control list and that the files are located in the shared workspace. Kisliakov fails to cure the deficiencies of Dalal. Accordingly, the applied references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1, 14 and 25.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 14 and 25 and the claims dependent therefrom, are patentable over the applied references. Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested.

II. New Claim 26 is Patentable

Claim 26 is added. Support for claim 26 can be found in the specification at, for example, original claim 1 and page 33, lines 8-14.

Independent claim 26 recites, *inter alia*, a shared workspace server "in which users of the site systems share and edit files cooperatively" and "a storage that stores the files which have been shared and edited, to allow a user to access the files after the sharing and the editing are completed." The applied references fail to teach or suggest these features. Dalal merely concerns real-time communications (RTC) and fails to concern the sharing and editing of files in the shared workspace cooperatively.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Obert H. Chu
Registration No. 52,744

JAO:OHC/jls

Attachments:

Amendment Transmittal
Request for Continued Examination

Date: October 4, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461